SOME NEW BOOKS.

American and European Constitutions.

At last we have a worthy supplement to the not yet superseded work of De Tocqueville on the United States. It is to a Swiss hand we owe the nearest approach to a monograph or a subject whose scope is indicated in the title of the book: *Adoption and Amendment of Constitutions in Europe and America*, by CHARLES BORGEAUD (Macmillans). What we have before us is an authorized English translation of the essay which, in 1893, obtained the Prix Rossi awarded by the faculty of law of the University of Paris. In an introduction, Mr. John M. Vincent of the Johns Hopkins University points out that, in 1887, the author of this book was made doctor in law at Geneva on presentation of a work on the History the Plebiscite in antiquity. This was a careful study of the conditions of ancient democracy, setting forth clearly in the atmosphere of their age the origin and development of popular rights. Dr. Borgeaud brought out plainly the distinction between ancient and modern political notions, and, in marking the limitations of popular rights, showed at least what one may not expect to find of precept or example in the past. Since the appearance of the book on the Plebiscite, he has devoted himself to the study of modern political institutions, and, from time to time, articles have appeared under his name in the *Annales de l'Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques* on the origins of later democratic phenomena. Turning his inquiries toward America, he prepared himself for an understanding of the colonies and States in the Union by long and careful investigations into the condition of Puritan England. Fruits of this study appeared in the Annales, and a series of those papers have been translated into English under the title of "The Rise of Modern Democracy in Old and New England." In opposition to recent theories, the writer of that book could detect but little continuous Germanic survival in the government and institutions of the colonists, for the reason that despotism had largely crushed these out of public life. He returned with accumulated evidence to the older and probably correct explanation that self-government in church matters gave birth to political democracy in New England.

I.

The present work is not a mere textual codification of the most recent articles of amendment in the constitutions of the civilized world, but is an exhibit of the historical development of each organic law, and, for its composition, required not only the examination of nearly two hundred constitutions, but a knowledge of the politics and history connected with each. In the introduction Mr. Vincent reminds us that the United States have forty-five constitutions and the Swiss Confederation has twenty-five in operation, facts which enable us to form some conception of the difficulty encountered in drawing general conclusions. Particular attention is also directed to certain positions taken by the author on constitutional questions. Of especial importance is his statement of the relation of statute law to constitutional law, a subject which seems to be much confused in the minds of legislators in many countries. In not a few cases, the makers of constitutions, not content to establish a framework of general principles about which a State shall be built, have gone on to anticipate the organizing Legislature by inserting private law, or acts of ordinary criminal jurisprudence. The new Constitution of New York, for instance, regulates the individual responsibility of stockholders in joint companies, a duty more properly laid upon a statute of bankruptcy. So, too, the form of gambling called pool selling is prohibited by name. The excellence of the measure and the reasons for putting the matter out of reach of legislators are obvious, but, as Mr. Vincent observes, this is not constitutional law. Nay, in the endeavor to fix things once for all, according to the prevailing mood of the electors, provisions even more illogical than those quoted are placed in constitutions, as, for example, in those of North and South Dakota, provisions that render the fundamental law inelastic, and limit the natural growth of society. If constitutional amendment is made easy, the popular sense of the stability of the State and the general respect for its charter of liberty are weakened. It is true enough, however, that everywhere the people are seeking for some means to control their legislators. They elect but fear and distrust their lawmakers. The experiments toward direct control now going on in Switzerland are attracting universal notice, and, from the Swiss author of this volume, they receive adequate consideration.

II.

Let us glance first at the chapter on the Constitutions of the several United States. He shows that these were not, and could not, have been founded on the teachings of Rousseau, although when one reads them one is inclined to infer the contrary. It was not from Rousseau, but from his predecessors, Locke and Wyse, that the legislators of Massachusetts, for example, in their first State Constitution, received their inspiration; yet their profession of political faith bears witness to the importance which they attached to the theory of which Rousseau is wrongfully assumed to be the author. The American evolver of the theory of social contract was Pastor John Wyse of Ipswich, who in a work published in 1717 expressed himself as follows: "Let us conceive in our mind a multitude of men all naturally free and equal going about voluntarily to erect themselves into a new commonwealth. Now, their condition being such, to bring themselves into a politic body, they must needs enter into divers covenants. (1.) They must interchangeably each man covenant to join in one lasting society, that they may be capable to concert the measures of their safety by a public vote. (2.) A vote or decree must then, nextly, pass to set up some particular species of government over them. And, if they are joined in their first compact upon absolute terms to stand to the decision of the first vote concerning the species of government, then all are bound by the majority to acquiesce in that particular form thereby settled, though their own private opinion incline them to some other model." Wyse's treatise was twice reprinted in 1772; at that moment the natural rights and social contract theory reigned triumphant in Boston. Not only was it taught from the pulpit as in harmony with the doctrine from which the Church covenants were derived, but philosophy had also taken it up with enthusiasm. Locke, who had previously received this doctrine at Westminster College from his independent masters, and had expounded it systematically, was the theme of constant discussion, both in the press and on the platform. On the principles laid down by Locke and Wyse were based the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights of 1772 and the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, which served as one of the chief patterns of the Federal Constitution of 1787.

III.

To what extent were the French revolutionists of 1789 indebted for their impulse and their ideal to the United States? It has been the fashion of recent historical writers, and conspicuously of Taine, to minimize the indebtment; Dr. Borgeaud takes the opposite line. He points out that John Adams had hardly finished his plan for a State Constitution of Massachusetts before he sailed for France, in November, 1779, carrying his scheme with him. Franklin, who had succeeded Voltaire in public favor, had preceded him, bearing his own production, the Pennsylvania Constitution. At that moment the thought of American liberty inspired Paris and all France with enthusiasm, for Frenchmen had greatly contributed to the birth of this freedom through their military aid. Proud of this and finding the principles proclaimed in the United States in harmony with their aspirations, Frenchmen eagerly adopted the new formulas. In 1783 Franklin caused all the Constitutions of America to be translated and published. The collection at once became famous and the subject of universal discussion. In 1787 the new Federal Constitution reached Paris, giving a new impetus to the dissertations of the philosophers, and imparting a new stimulus to the popular interest. Dr. Borgeaud submits that, in view of these facts, it would have been astonishing if American ideas had not played a rôle, and an important one, in the cahiers of 1789. The cahiers of the Third Estate, which "is as yet nothing, and is shortly to become everything," demanded almost unanimously that the coming Assembly, in which they wished to have the three orders united, should adopt a Declaration of Rights and determine the basis of a written Constitution before granting any tax or enacting any legislation. A fundamental law, made by the nation itself, and intended to protect the State against the abuses of authority, this is indeed the definition of the modern democratic Constitution. Sieyès thought himself the inventor of it, but Lafayette protested in favor of America against the pretension historically so unwarranted.

IV.

Constitutions differ in many ways. Above all, they differ in the source from which they emanate. This distinction is the basis of the classification adopted in this book. The author divides contemporary written Constitutions into two main categories, according to their origin and legal character: on the one hand, compacts and royal charters; on the other, Constitutions resting exclusively upon the principle of popular sovereignty. Instead of offering typical examples of the two kinds, which would be, of course, the Prussian organic law, on the one hand, and that of the Swiss Confederation, on the other, it may be well to glance at the author's remarks upon written Constitutions in general. It is well known that Catholic political writers like De Maistre, have held that a Constitution is a divine work which man cannot elaborate. The author of this book, on the other hand, agrees with Thomas Paine, who said that a Constitution does not exist so long as it cannot be carried in the pocket, meaning that a Constitution must be written. It is true enough that a Constitution cannot be improvised. It is not the aim of written Constitutions to create forms of government out of nothing. It is to protect or develop those forms which already exist, whether they be the outcome of a violent revolution or of a gradual and peaceful evolution. When a people frames for itself a Constitution, it formulates its public law either in its existing form, or with such changes as seem desirable, so as to render it a real safeguard against all attempts to undermine popular liberties. Since in a monarchical State the sceptre is liable to fall into bad hands, protection must be there sought against the executive power; in a republic, it will rather be sought against the legislative power. An advanced democracy will have to guard against its own excesses. A written Constitution is then essentially a law of political protection, a law of guarantees; guaranteeing the nation against the usurpation of the authority to which she necessarily confides the exercise of her sovereign power; guaranteeing also the minority against the omnipotence of the majority. Having taken such precautions, a Constitution proceeds ordinarily to declare the right of citizens to determine exactly the organization of the different branches of the Government and their relations to each other, and, in many cases, to make certain special provisions rendered necessary by peculiar conditions. A Constitution thus elaborated does not exhibit, of course, the complete code of the constitutional law of the country. There exist along with it traditions and usages which may possess great importance as unwritten law. Recalling the fact that no article in our Federal Constitution forbids the reëlection of a President for the second time, the author points out that nevertheless, since Washington, in the interest of the public good, made the sacrifice of the third Presidency, which he was urged to accept, no one who has held the office of President for two terms has dared to present himself for the third time for the suffrages of the electors. Similar examples of unwritten law are cited even from countries which cling most tenaciously to the principle of positive enactment. It appears that the French courts have on several occasions based their decisions upon certain articles introduced into the public law of the State by Constitutions which have long since disappeared. For instance, Article 75 of the Constitution of the year VIII. provided that the agents of the Government, other than the Ministers, should not be prosecuted for deeds pertaining to the discharge of their functions, except by permission of the Council of State. The principle evolved in this article was applied by the courts under all Administrations down to 1870, when, because this rule had given very great dissatisfaction under the last reign, it was decreed Sept. 19, 1870, that "Article 75 of the Constitution of the year VIII. is repealed." The author concludes a preliminary discussion of the subject with the observation that the democratic State is the one which most needs a strong written Constitution. In a monarchy, where, de facto or de jure, the prince possesses a personal power, minorities may find in him a protector. In a democracy, a law which is above the legislator himself is their only safeguard against a usurping majority; a temporary safeguard, it is true, since, in the last resort, the will of numbers must prevail, but still a safeguard, and of prime importance, because it prevents surprises, because it enables resistance to organize, and because it at least obliges the majority to measure the scope and bearing of its acts before accomplishing them.

V.

This book is a mine of information nowhere else accessible within a pair of covers in relation to all the written Constitutions of the world, including, moreover, not only those which exist to-day, but those which have been superseded. The author dwells at length on the Federal Constitutions of the United States, the German empire, and the Swiss Confederation, but he overlooks none of the State organic laws of the commonwealths which make up those collective entities. Adequate attention is paid also to the Constitutions of the Latin, Scandinavian, and Slavic groups, including Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Roumania, Greece, Servia, Bulgaria, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway and Sweden. No less than eight chapters are devoted to the constitutional history of France from the enactment of the Constitution of 1791 to the constitutional laws passed in 1875, and which, with some modifications, are still operative. It is only the author's remarks upon these last-mentioned laws and upon the methods prescribed for their amendment, to which we can now refer. It will be remembered that when the two Chambers met in joint session at Versailles for the purpose of choosing a successor to M. Casimir-Périer, the Socialists insisted that the National Assembly once convoked could proceed to a drastic revision of the Constitution, a claim to which no heed was paid by M. Challemel-Lacour, the presiding officer of the National Assembly. Where the powers of constitutional amendment are lodged does indeed constitute an urgent and burning question in French politics. It may recur at any moment, and, should the Socialists and their allies, the advanced Radicals, ever attain a majority in the joint session of the Chambers, there is apparently no limit to the changes in the existing organic law that they might make. The conflicting views upon this point expressed by eminent lawyers are set forth concisely in the book before us. In a vague and general way, it will be acknowledged by all French jurists of our day that three fundamental principles have issued from the precedents and documents, and may be considered established by the Revolution and reäffirmed by all the régimes which, since 1879, have sought the source of their authority in the sovereignty of the nation. The principles are these: France must have a written Constitution, clearly differentiated from ordinary laws; secondly, this Constitution can only proceed from a constituent power, which is superior to all constituted authority; lastly, constituent power resides in the people. The interpretation of the first two of these principles has never varied. On the other hand, the application of the third principle has changed with changing circumstances. The Assembly of 1789 considered that the mission with which it was invested by its election, by the task imposed upon it in the cahiers, gave it the right to exercise constituent authority in the name of the nation. The Convention declared that the primary assemblies only were competent to approve its work, which it on two occasions submitted to them. The National Assembly of 1848 thought it received from universal suffrage, established for the purpose of conferring it, the right of approval as well as the right of initiative. The public law of the two empires, in its final form, at the end of its evolution, recognized the Chief Executive as possessing the right of proposal, and the country directly consulted that of decision. But with the exception of the period of the charters of the Restoration and the July monarchy, under none of the régimes born of the great Revolution had the supreme right of the people ever been contested. The National Assembly which met at Bordeaux Feb. 12, 1871, and which decided on March 10 to postpone the questions relating to the form of government, and to remove to Versailles, did not enact constitutional laws until four years later, in 1875. The majority desired the restoration of the monarchy, and it was hardly possible for France to establish a Constitution before she knew definitely that she was not to have a charter. It was only when all hope of an immediate restoration had to be abandoned that the Assembly, yielding to the demands of the republicans, decided to act upon the organization of the public authority. Under such conditions, with a majority determined to frame only a provisional Constitution, and endeavoring to give it an anonymous character, the unparalleled difficulties, which the Assembly had to overcome in order to carry through the laws of 1875, are not surprising. As a matter of fact, even the word "republic" may be said to have barely forced its way into the Constitution, and to have been tolerated rather than established by a majority vote. The famous Wallon amendment, which called the Chief Executive President of the republic, was adopted by 353 votes against 352. No Constitution ever saw itself so obliged to look forward to its early revision, and almost to declare itself temporary, in order to quiet doubts and suspicions; it was only voted on the condition that it might be early and easily revised. What, then, was the process of constitutional amendment adopted? Article VIII. of the law of Feb. 25, 1875, provides for revision as follows: "The Chambers shall have the right, in separate resolutions, adopted in each by a majority vote, either of their own accord or at the request of the President of the republic, to declare that the Constitution ought to be revised. After each of the two Chambers shall have passed this resolution, they shall meet together as a National Assembly for the purpose of proceeding with the work of revision. The discussions upon the partial or total revision of the Constitution must be decided by an absolute majority of the entire membership of the National Assembly." Touching the meaning of this article a question of paramount importance has been raised, and still excites the most heated controversy. Does the National Assembly exercise complete and unlimited constituent power, or is its competence restricted by the text of the resolution of the Chambers by virtue whereof it is summoned? This question provoked a discussion in the Chamber of Deputies for the first time in 1882. Gambetta, then President of the Council, maintained that the powers of the Convention were limited. M. Clémenceau maintained that they were unlimited. Since then the disputes have reäppeared whenever a proposition has been made to revise the Constitution. Among jurists, M. Edouard Laferrière and Prof. Jalabert of the Paris Law Faculty contend that the law of Feb. 25, 1875, demands an agreement of both Chambers for the convocation of a National Assembly, and that this presupposes a previous agreement upon the sort of activity this Assembly may enter into. On the other hand, the theory which ascribes unlimited powers to the National Assembly once convoked is advocated in the Faculty of Aix by M. Félix Moreau, who argues that the resolution by virtue of which the Assembly is called together may only contain the words, "the Constitution ought to be revised." But, whatever be the tenor of the resolutions adopted in either or both of the Chambers, he thinks that the Assembly is not obliged to conform to them with respect to the matter it will discuss. "It is inconceivable," he says, "that constituted authorities may limit the right of the constituent power." Dr. Borgeaud suggests a simple and practical method of settling the controversy. Whenever the French Parliament thinks the time is ripe for such an act, it may put an end to all the uncertainties and disputes about the attributes of the National Assembly by deciding that its amendments shall be submitted to the approval of the people. It is true that no article of the Constitution of 1875 provides for such a measure, but, on the other hand, none forbids it. Such a submission would be neither the Napoleonic Plebiscite nor the Swiss Referendum. It would be the invocation of the popular vote which was in vogue under the First Republic, with this difference greatly in its favor, that the popular verdict would be given in time of peace, and under a régime which would have seen the rise of a new generation. Then a fundamental tradition of French public law, interrupted by peculiar political circumstances, would be renewed, and the difficulty which has resulted from this break would disappear. Once let a constitutional law be submitted to the approval of the sovereign people, and the chief objection made by M. Clémenceau and others against restricting the powers of the National Assembly by the resolutions convoking it would fall to the ground. The Assembly would become like the American Constitutional Convention, the people's committee on the Constitution, and would be no longer subordinate in any way to Parliament. The fundamental law would regain instantly its transcendent majesty. It would be based upon a verdict from which there could be no appeal.

M. W. H.

Bismarck.

The short *Life of Prince Bismarck* by CHARLES LOWE (Roberts Brothers) is founded on the large two-volume biography by the same author, but it includes much fresh material which has come to light during the last two years, and brings down the political career of the great Chancellor to the present day. The long biography was noticed in these columns when it appeared, and we here confine ourselves to indicating some of the interesting features of the new material collected for this little book.

I.

What were the exact facts in regard to Bismarck's withdrawal from public life? It was only some little time after his retirement to Friedrichsruh that the world was made fully aware of the true manner of his parting from the Emperor. Public enlightenment on this point came from the ex-Chancellor himself. At the time of his quitting Berlin (March 29, 1890), amid circumstances of popular demonstration and imperial attention which caused him to remark that he had been treated to a "first-class funeral," it was generally supposed that he had gone less by compulsion than of his own accord. This theory of the case seemed to be borne out by the words of the rescript with which the Emperor had accepted the Prince's resignation. The ex-Chancellor, however, had not been many days in the Sachsenwald when he used the word Entlassung (dismissal) with reference to his retirement from office. It happened also that, two days after the Emperor had accepted his Chancellor's resignation, his Majesty telegraphed to a friend in Weimar that "my heart feels as sorrowful as if I had again lost my grandfather." A Conservative friend suggested to Bismarck that the Prince should look upon these words as a very great compliment. "What!" replied the Prince, boiling with rage. "Do you call that a compliment? Why, I was driven away like a dog!" The author goes on to show that, in truth, the Chancellor had been compelled by the Emperor to resign. Grave differences of opinion had already divided them on the subject of the Socialist law and the question of ministerial responsibility. As regards the latter point, it should be noted that the Prussian Constitution asserted the direct responsibility of each Minister to the Crown, and not the responsibility of all the Ministers to the Premier. In the course of time, however, Bismarck had converted the Prussian theory into the English practice, and made himself virtual dictator over his ministerial colleagues. William II. made up his mind to revert to the original Prussian theory, and, sooner or later, he would have quarrelled with Bismarck on the subject. But the spark that actually fired the mine was a political interview which the Chancellor had granted to Dr. Windthorst, leader of the Clericals. On hearing of this the Emperor sent his Cabinet Secretary to the Chancellor with the message, "The Emperor requires that you should not receive members of the Reichstag without previously reporting to his Majesty." To this the Prince replied, "Please tell the Emperor that I allow no one to have any control over my own threshold." Next day the Emperor rose early and went to the Prince's house, where he declared that he had every right to know of the Chancellor's negotiations with party leaders. The Prince, however, refused to admit the claim, and repeated his observation of the previous night. The Emperor, in much agitation, rejoined, "Not even when I command you to do it as your sovereign?" To this Bismarck returned, "My master's authority ends at my wife's drawing room," and went on to say that he had only remained in office in consequence of his promise to the old Emperor to serve his grandson. Thereupon the Emperor demanded the Prince's resignation. Early next day, Gen. von Hanke, the Emperor's military secretary, repaired to the Chancellor to inform him in continuation of the conversation of the day before that the Emperor expected his resignation, and was willing to receive him for that purpose at 2 o'clock. The Prince declared that the state of his health did not admit of his going out, and that he must beg time to prepare a written communication in consequence of the Emperor's message. He then summoned a meeting of the Prussian Cabinet to communicate the facts to his colleagues. Some hours later the Emperor's Cabinet Secretary, Herr von Lucanus, went to the Chancellor's house with a short message about the Prince's resignation and an expression of surprise that it had not yet been tendered. Then it was offered; it was instantly accepted, with profuse expressions of gratitude for the Chancellor's past services, accompanied by the Emperor's portrait, the Prince's appointment as Colonel-General of cavalry, with the rank of Field Marshal, and his patent as Duke of Lauenburg. But, as the Prince had refused to accept the pension that was proffered to him for his services, so he also declined to become entombed in the new ducal title. The author of this book tells us that once a letter arrived at Friedrichsruh addressed to the "Duchess of Lauenburg." The Princess handed it across the table to her husband, who raised his right hand to his temple, as if saluting, and said in a formal tone: "Delighted, madam, to make your acquaintance;" adding, "If ever I wish to travel incognito, I shall call myself Duke of Lauenburg."

II.

When first the Emperor and his Chancellor parted, the former, by sending a birthday messenger to Friedrichsruh, and by other attentions, showed that he wished to continue on a footing of formal friendship, at least, with the man to whom he and his dynasty owed so much. When, moreover, a fortnight after the Chancellor's departure from Berlin, a representative committee under the President of the Reichstag was formed for the purpose of erecting a national monument to the great national hero, now out of harness, the Emperor wrote a letter expressing his hearty commendation of the scheme, with the hope that all classes of the population would cordially contribute to its success. This state of things, however, did not last. It soon became apparent that the ex-Chancellor was a man with a grievance, and Friedrichsruh became what Mr. Lowe would describe as a kind of modern Delphi, or latter-day prophet's Mecca, to the pilgrims of the press. The effect of Bismarck's criticisms and disclosures was to convince the Emperor and his advisers that the ex-Chancellor had become a provoker of very serious discords, not only in Germany, but also in the field of her relations to foreign powers, and that something must be done either to prevent a continuance of the evil or to remedy its pernicious consequences. These utterances of the resentful Prince, so it was argued in high quarters at Berlin, were not the mere harebrained chatter of irresponsible frivolity, but the deliberate revelations of a mind which had been made the trusted repository of all the State secrets of his time. It was charged that, apart from the boldness and outspokenness of his criticisms on the acts and policy of the Emperor who had dismissed him, Bismarck had lifted the veil from certain transactions and events which ought to have been kept concealed. In other words, he had done precisely what he had punished Count Harry von Arnim for doing. At least, the Emperor thought so; for, soon after the first knot of interviewers had been feasted in a double sense at Friedrichsruh, and less than two months after Bismarck had left Berlin, his Majesty authorized his new Chancellor, Gen. Caprivi, to address a circular to all the representatives of Germany and Prussia abroad, requesting them to parry and allay the damaging effect of the Prince's revelations and strictures. It was not till more than two years later, when the breach between the Emperor and his ex-Chancellor seemed to have become irreparable, that the circular was published to the world. But the author has no doubt that Bismarck was informed of the existence of the circular soon after it was issued. Far, however, from accepting in a spirit of humility and penitence the official correction which had been thus administered to him, the rebellious prince became all the more critical and querulous. Either in table talk addressed directly to his visitors or through the pens of his press instruments, and especially through the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, the ex-Chancellor took to denouncing the policy of his successor toward England, which, it was alleged, had befooled him in the matter of the African convention; toward Russia, which he was fast throwing into the arms of France, and toward Austria, which had led him by the nose in the matter of the new commercial treaties. To all this bitter criticism, the only reply was the Emperor's announcement at a military banquet that he had just raised his new Chancellor, Caprivi, to the rank of Count, "as a reward of his distinguished and devoted labor." This was a hard stroke for Bismarck to bear. He had himself been made a Count for humbling Austria, and now, for humoring the same power, his successor in office had been raised to the same rank.

III.

It is well known that eventually the quarrel between William II. and his ex-Chancellor grew to be one of the gravest scandals of the time, and formed matter for sincere lament with all patriotic Germans. On the domestic affairs of the empire it exercised a most disturbing influence, and it was impossible to say in what its continuance might not result. Evidently the man who had made the German empire could not, even in his retirement, be treated as a negligible quantity. Yet, for a long time, it seemed as if the parties to the quarrel had hardened their hearts against all reconciliation. At the time of the Kiel meeting between the Czar and the Emperor, which Bismarck described as an "untoward incident," an attempt was made to bring William II. and his ex-Chancellor together. It came to nothing, the Emperor proving much more obdurate than he had shown himself in the case of another diplomatic servant, Count Limburg-Stirum, who had been prosecuted but pardoned for writing mildly against the commercial treaties which were fiercely denounced by Bismarck. In Prussia, where the Government is carried on by permanent officials, the theory is that servants of the State, even when out of office, may not agitate against its policy or the persons of its chiefs. Again, when the Reichstag was dissolved in the early summer of 1893, and the nation was appealed to on behalf of the new Army bill, it was calculated that a reconciliation could not fail to have a most favorable effect on the election, and a vain effort was made to bring about the meeting between the Emperor and the Prince at the unveiling of a monument in Görlitz to William I. In the autumn of the same year, however, Bismarck fell seriously ill at Kissengen, and then the Emperor's heart seems to have been touched. He telegraphed to the Prince from Güns, in Austria, where he was attending the military manœuvres with his imperial ally, expressing the greatest concern at the ex-Chancellor's indisposition, and begging him, in view of the unfavorable climatic situation of Varzin and Friedrichsruh, to take up his quarters for the winter in one of the imperial castles in central Germany. This offer Bismarck declined, sharing, as he said, the opinion of his doctor (Schweninger) that "my complaint being of a nervous character, if I pass the winter in the midst of my accustomed surroundings and occupations, it will be the likeliest means of promoting my recovery." It looked as if Bismarck was not willing to accept the olive branch held out to him; and the speech which the Emperor subsequently delivered at Bremen, where he eulogized his father and grandfather as the real founders of the empire, which they certainly were not, was thought to reveal his Majesty's bitterness against the implacable exile at Friedrichsruh.

A few months passed away, and then the Emperor, of his own impulse, determined to make another advance. For this purpose he despatched in January, 1894, to Friedrichsruh one of his personal aides-de-camp, Lieut.-Col. von Moltke, a nephew of the great "battle thinker," to congratulate the Prince on his recovery from an attack of influenza and present him with a bottle of very fine old hock. The ex-Chancellor accepted the gift, and said that he would come to Berlin to thank the Emperor in person on the occasion of his Majesty's approaching birthday. As the author of this book puts it, all Germany was more or less intoxicated with that single flask of rare old Rhenish which the Emperor had sent to Friedrichsruh. Very likely there was some political calculation in the Emperor's act, but it is fair to assume that there was more of what may be termed movement of the heart. Hence the sudden change of scene that was beheld by the Berliners on the day before their Kaiser's thirty-fifth birthday and military jubilee, a scene the like of which had not been witnessed in the Prussian capital since Bismarck himself, nearly four years previously, underwent what he himself called the mockery of a first-class funeral. Even on his dismissal a squadron of cuirassiers had escorted him to the station from which, a year later still, his compeer, Moltke, made his final exit from the scene. The Kaiser did not then accompany his departing Chancellor, as he did follow sorrowfully the body of his great Field Marshal. Time, however, which heals so many wounds, also brings round some amazing changes, and on Jan. 26, 1894, Bismarck having been escorted from the station by the Emperor's brother, and accompanied back to it by the Emperor himself, formed the central figure in the pageant of the heart which provoked more patriotic enthusiasm than had ever been displayed in Berlin since the triumphal entry of the troops returning from the war with France. In less than a month later the Emperor returned his ex-Chancellor's visit at Friedrichsruh, and soon afterward, on the occasion of the Prince's seventy-ninth birthday, his Majesty sent him a magnificent steel cuirass. "May the solid steel," wrote his Majesty, "which is to cover your breast be regarded as the symbol of German gratitude, which enfolds you with its steadfast loyalty, and to which I, too, desire to give my eloquent expression." "I shall don this new breastplate," replied the Prince, "as the symbol of your Majesty's gracious favor, and leave it to my children as a lasting memento of the same."

Here the volume before us ends, but the still more memorable celebration of Bismarck's eightieth birthday has furnished matter for a new chapter, which will, of course, be added to the next edition of this book.

Mr. Gladstone's Kinsfolk and Home.

There have been many lives of GLADSTONE. The present short biography, written by HENRY W. LUCY and published by Roberts Brothers, is a well-conceived and successful attempt to sketch rapidly, and in chronological order, the main course of a phenomenally busy life, enriching the narrative, wherever possible, with autobiographical scraps from Mr. Gladstone's public speeches, and supplementing it by personal notes made over a period of twenty years, during which unquestionably the author of "A Diary of Two Parliaments" had unusual opportunities of studying the subject. It is the least familiar phases in the early life of the veteran statesman to which we shall here refer.

I.

The boyhood and the kinsfolk of Mr. Gladstone—that is a topic with which but few of those who know the orator and statesman are thoroughly conversant. Sir Bernard Burke professes to be able to find the blood of Henry III. of England and Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, in the veins of the subject of this biography. More interesting, because in all likelihood more authentic, is a memorandum which Mr. Lucy has found in a note addressed to him by the late Mr. W. H. Gladstone. Writing from Hawarden Rectory under the date of Nov. 13, 1881, he says: "Through my mother's mother, who was a Neville, the daughter of the second Lord Braybrooke, my father becomes connected with Lord Chatham, Mr. Pitt, and Mr. Grenville, formerly Prime Minister, and Mr. Wyndham, formerly Chancellor of the Exchequer." Mr. Gladstone's father was a merchant in Liverpool, whither he had gone from Leith, where Thomas Gladstone, grandfather of our subject, had established himself as a corn merchant. As far as records go, the Gladstones have been remarkable for large families. Mr. Gladstone's great-grandfather, who, by the way, spelled his name "Gledstanes," had eleven children. His fourth son, Thomas, had sixteen, and it will indicate the social and commercial position of Mr. Gladstone's grandfather to mention the fact that he was able to do something for his seven surviving sons as they successively started in business. Here let us pause for a moment to recall one of Mr. Gladstone's utterances: "I am not slow to claim the name of Scotchman," he told a delighted audience at Dundee during one of the Midlothian campaigns, "and even if I were, there is the fact staring me in the face that not a drop of blood runs in my veins except what is derived from Scottish ancestors." Returning to the thread of the biography, we note that John Gladstone, the father of William Ewart, settled at an early age in Liverpool, as a sort of clerk in the house of Corrie & Co., a firm in which he presently became a partner. When, some sixteen years later, the firm was dissolved, John Gladstone took into partnership his brother Robert, and began with fresh ardor to extend his commercial operations. The new firm was among the earliest traders with Russia, and they snatched at the East India trade when the monopoly of the old East India Company was broken down. But their principal business was with the West Indies, where John Gladstone held large sugar plantations, a circumstance which had a good deal to do with moulding the early political career of his son. It is pleasant to learn that Mr. Gladstone is proud of his father. Not without reason. John Gladstone, brought into contact at a critical epoch with the active life of a growing community like that of Liverpool, soon began to take a prominent part in public affairs. When, in 1812, Canning contested a famous election in Liverpool, John Gladstone threw himself heart and soul into the advocacy of the cause of the great Minister. He addressed public meetings in his behalf, and it was from the balcony of his house in Rodney street that Mr. Canning spoke to the enthusiastic crowd, which, as the result of his election, hailed him member from Liverpool. In the house at that time was a little boy destined to fill in history a larger space even than does Canning. William Ewart Gladstone was then in his third year, and doubtless from some upper window looked out with wondering eyes upon the turbulent crowd and heard the Minister talking of Catholic emancipation and other matters to him strange and unintelligible. We have, indeed, his personal testimony on this interesting point. On the occasion of his reaching his seventieth year, Dec. 29, 1879, Mr. Gladstone received a deputation of gentlemen, and, in the course of his speech to them, said: "I remember the first election of Mr. Canning in Liverpool." It appears that, of all the great men with whom Mr. Gladstone has at one time or another come into personal contact, it is for Canning that he has retained the greatest admiration and reverence. "I was bred," he one night told the House of Commons, "under the shadow of the great name of Canning. Every influence connected with that name governed the politics of my childhood and of my youth. With Canning I rejoiced in the removal of religious disabilities and in the character which he gave to our policy abroad. With Canning I rejoiced in the opening he made toward the establishment of free commercial interchanges between nations. With Canning, and under the shadow of that great name, and under the shadow of the yet more venerable name of Burke, my youthful mind and imagination were impressed."

II.

Our subject's father, John Gladstone, entered Parliament some years later. The biographer has not been able to determine whether he heard the maiden speech of his son when returned for Newark, but he certainly sat in the same Parliament with his son, and lived long enough to see the promise of William's youth partially realized. In 1845, Sir Robert Peel, partly in recognition of personal merit, but partly doubtless in compliment to the brilliant young colleague who was the bright particular star of his Ministry, made the elder Gladstone a baronet. Six years later, Sir John died and the title went to Thomas, his eldest son. While he lived, no one out of the limits of the county of Kincardine knew or heard of Sir Thomas Gladstone. Sometimes during the Parliamentary sessions, people passing through the lobby of the House of Commons were startled at the sight of a tall, spare figure, with a face singularly like Mr. Gladstone's, if one could imagine it, with the fire gone out. A quiet, retiring country gentleman, Sir Thomas Gladstone, on rare visits to London, flitted about the precincts of the House of Commons, silent, unnoticing and unnoticed, a sort of wraith of his brother. There was another brother, who lived in Liverpool, and maintained the commercial relations of the Gladstone family. This was Robertson Gladstone, a man who, though he took a fair share of the work of local government in the town, did not aspire to deal with affairs outside the limits of the borough. It will be remembered that there was an occasion when Robertson, moved with honest indignation and fraternal love, employed a maladroit trope when discussing the public position of his brother. After this he was confirmed in his natural inclination to retirement from participation in public affairs, and in 1875 there passed away from human sight the colossal, burly figure which, with hands hidden in stupendous waistcoat pockets, long strode the streets of Liverpool.

III.

A word more is needed to dispose of this branch of the subject. In 1839, William Ewart Gladstone married Miss Catherine Glynne, daughter of Sir Stephen Glynne of Hawarden Castle, Flintshire. He has had eight children. One, the second daughter, died in 1850. His eldest daughter is married to the head master of Wellington College. A younger one to the Rev. Mr. Drew. A third, unmarried, is Principal of Newnham College, Cambridge. Of his four sons, the eldest, William Henry, sat in one House of Commons as member for Whitby, and, in another, as the representative of East Worcestershire; a man of gentle and retiring disposition, he did not take kindly to the turmoil of politics, and, when opportunity presented itself, he withdrew. The second son is rector of Hawarden. In 1875, the torrent of abuse to which Mr. Gladstone was subjected took in a London weekly paper the line of accusation that the ex-Premier had presented his son, ordained in 1870, to one of the richest and easiest livings of the Church. This statement touched Mr. Gladstone to the quick. He wrote: "This easy living entailed the charge of 8,000 people scattered over 17,000 acres, and fast increasing in numbers. The living is not in the gift of the Crown. I did not present him to the living or recommend him to be presented. He was not ordained in 1870." "My relations," he added, "have no special cause to thank me for any advice given by me to the sovereign in the matter of church patronage." His third son, Henry, followed the family traditions by entering upon commercial pursuits, and spending some years in India. He married the daughter of Lord Rendel, and still stands apart from politics. The only politician among the sons is the youngest. Mr. Herbert Gladstone made his first appearance in the political arena by contesting Middlesex in 1880. Defeated there, he was returned for Leeds two months later, and still represents a Leeds borough for the House of Commons. For a time he acted as private secretary for his father, the Premier, though he received no salary. He became in succession a Lord of the Treasury and Financial Secretary to the War Office, a secretaryship to the Home Office being the highest post to which his omnipotent father promoted him. Upon Mr. Gladstone's retirement, in 1884, colleagues who had been working with Mr. Herbert Gladstone made haste to do him fuller justice, promoting him to the position of First Commissioner of Works. Such is the record of the family of an illustrious statesman, four times Chief Minister of a nation whose wealth is illimitable, and whose power reaches to the ends of the earth. No reader of this volume will deny that Mr. Lucy is justified in saying that few more suggestive chapters of biography have been penned than that which shows the son of a man who has made many bishops, rector of the family parish in Flintshire; one of his daughters married to a schoolmaster, a second herself a schoolmistress, and another of his sons sitting at an office desk.

IV.

A word, perhaps, should be said about the estate of Hawarden, which is now so inseparably associated with the name of the great Minister. It appears from some data communicated to the author of this book in 1881 by the late Mr. W. H. Gladstone, that the estate of Hawarden was purchased by Serjeant Glynne from the agents of Sequestration after the execution of James, Earl of Derby, in 1651. It had come first into the Stanley family in 1443, when it was granted by Henry VI. to Sir Thomas Stanley, Comptroller of his Household. The grant was recalled in 1450, but four years later it was restored to Sir Thomas, afterward Lord Stanley. After his death it descended to his second wife, Margaret, Countess of Richmond, on whose decease it descended to Thomas, Earl of Derby, and remained in that family till 1651. On the restoration, when the Commons rejected the bill for restoring those estates of lords which had been alienated under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, Charles, Earl of Derby, compounded with Sergeant Glynne for the property of Hawarden, and granted it to him and his heirs. The old castle had been acquired by the Parliament in 1643, being betrayed to Sir William Brereton, but was besieged soon after by the royalists, and surrendered to Sir Michael Ernley Dec. 5, 1643. The royalists held it for some two years, after which it was taken by Sir Henry Myton. It was soon after dismantled, and its further destruction was effected by its owner, Sir William Glynne, in 1665. There is no tradition of the Earls of Derby making the castle their residence subsequent to the death of the Countess of Richmond, but it is certain that it was not untenable till dismantled by final order of the Parliament in 1647. The Glynne family were first heard of in Wales at Glyn Llyfon in Carnarvonshire in 1567. A knighthood was conferred on Sir William, son of Sergeant, afterward Chief Justice, Glynne. Sir William, son of the Chief Justice, who also sat in Parliament for Carnarvonshire in 1660, was created a baronet in 1661 during his father's lifetime. About this time the family became connected with Oxfordshire, but did not reside at Hawarden till 1727, when Sir Stephen, second Baronet, built a house there. A new one was built shortly after in 1772, by Sir John Glynne, who, by an alliance with the family of Ravenscroft, acquired the adjoining property of Broadlane. This house, then called Broadlane House, is the kernel of the present residence known as Hawarden Castle. Sir John Glynne, the sixth baronet, applied himself to improving and developing the property on a large scale by enclosing, draining, and planting, and under him the castle grew to its present aspect and dimensions. The park contains some 200 acres. The plantations cover about 500. The whole estate comprises upward of 7,000 acres. In 1809 the house, built of brick, was much enlarged, encased in stone in the castellated style, and under the name it now bears. Further improvements were made by the late Sir Stephen Glynne in 1831. The new block, however, containing Mr. Gladstone's study, was not added till 1884.

V.

The biographer tells us that Mr. Gladstone's room has three windows and two fireplaces, and is completely lined with bookcases. There are three writing tables. The first Mr. Gladstone uses for political, the second for literary work; the third is occupied by Mrs. Gladstone. The room has busts and other likenesses of Sydney Herbert, of the Duke of Newcastle, of Tennyson, of Canning, Cobden, Homer, and others. In the centre may be seen the specimen of an axe from Nottingham, the blade of which is singularly long and narrow, and contrasts strongly with the American pattern, to which Mr. Gladstone is much addicted. It appears that Mr. Gladstone sold his collections of china and pictures in 1874, retaining, however, those of ivories and antique jewels, which have been exhibited at South Kensington and elsewhere. His library contains over ten thousand volumes, and is very rich in theology. Separate compartments are assigned in it to Homer, Shakspeare, and Dante. The chief portraits in the house, outside of those above mentioned, are those of Sir Kenelm Digby by Van Dyck, an ancestor of Honora Conway, Sir John Glynne's wife; Lady Lucy Stanley, daughter of Thomas, Earl of Northumberland, mother to Sir K. Digby's wife; Jane Warburton, afterward Duchess of Argyll; Sir William Glynne, first Baronet, ascribed to Sir Peter Lely; Chief Justice Glynne, as a young man, and another portrait of him in a judicial robe; Lady Sandys, grandmother to Sir William Glynne's wife; Lady Wheeler, daughter of Sir Stephen Glynne; Sir Robert Williams of Penwayne, who married a daughter of the Chief Justice; Catherine Grenville, afterward Lady Braybrooke, and mother of Lady Glynne; Mrs. Gladstone, by Saye; Lady Lyttelton, by Saye; the late Sir Stephen Gladstone, by Eden; Mr. Gladstone's own portrait by W. B. Richmond; Viscountess Vane, née Hawes; Charles I., Henrietta Maria, his Queen, copies from Van Dyck, and several others, one attributed to Gainsborough. We may note finally that, in this room where Mr. Gladstone spends the greater part of his life, there are busts of Pitt, of Mrs. Gladstone, of Sir John Glynne, the Rev. Henry Glynne, of Mr. Gladstone himself by Mr. Marochetti, and other statesmen.

COALING STATIONS FOR THE NAVY.

The Department Aroused to the Necessity for a Supply Station in the West Indies.

WASHINGTON, June 1.—That there is urgent necessity for the acquisition of an island somewhere in the West Indies for a coaling station, where American war ships can at all times be furnished fuel at a reasonable cost, was made apparent during the recent cruise of Admiral Meade's magnificent fleet of naval vessels off the South and Central American republics. Assistant Secretary of the Navy William McAdoo made an exhaustive study of the needs of the service in this direction during the cruise, and in a report to the department, will point out that the day is passed when the United States should be forced to purchase coal from British merchants at an exorbitant price and for a quality vastly inferior to that mined at Pocahontas, Va., which is now used on nearly all naval vessels attached to the home station. There is no question that the United States can find plenty of islands in the Southern waters admirably adapted for a station of supplies for United States war ships, and at the next session of Congress the Secretary will endeavor to secure permission to enter into some arrangement by which the State Department can acquire some island for that purpose.

From time immemorial our ships in Southern waters have had to depend for their coal supply on foreign merchants, who held the department at their mercy and compelled it to pay any price they demanded. The great coaling centres are chiefly owned and occupied by Great Britain or her subjects. This coal is brought over from Cardiff and is loaded into United States vessels for about $4 a ton more than it can be taken from an American port in schooners and placed in the bunkers. Early last autumn, when it was determined to despatch a big fleet to the West Indies, the department made inquiries as to the prices charged by the coal dealers in West Indian ports, and learned that, through exclusive rights and privileges exercised for years, naval ships were compelled to pay fancy prices for their coal. It was then that Secretary Herbert decided to thwart the English and other foreign coal monopolists. Before the departure of the fleet contracts were made by the department for several thousand tons of coal to be sent out in schooners to the fleet at the various points where it could be conveniently taken on. These schooners sailed from Baltimore to Key West, Kingston, and other ports touched by the ships and supplied the entire squadron with American coal throughout the cruise, and thus saved the department thousands of dollars, which otherwise would have gone for coal exported from England and acknowledged to be of an inferior grade. The great difficulty about this means of supplying the West Indian fleet is the expense in loading and the tedious manner in which it is handled, owing to lack of proper facilities for coaling ships in the open bay. Another objection is the uncertainty regarding the movements of the fleets and the necessity of taking the coal from the schooners when they arrive, whether the vessels require it or not. No American coal can be landed in the West Indian Islands, and when shipped from a United States port must be transferred direct from the schooner to the war ship's bunkers. Under this plan coal can be shipped only to supply temporary demands, and there can be no certainty that a naval fleet can find a schooner with a supply on hand when it is most needed. In fact, great difficulty was found last winter in securing help from the islands to coal ships, owing to the objections raised by contractors to permitting the introduction of American coal while British coal was lying at the docks.

There is in the possession of the Navy Department a map which indicates the extent of British coaling stations in every part of the world. This map shows that Great Britain has surrounded the United States with fortified coaling stations, where her vessels can at all times fill their bunkers and receive necessary repairs. These stations are within a few days' sailing of our coast, and some within forty-eight hours. Each is garrisoned and protected with fortifications. In the West Indies Great Britain has stations in Nassau, 200 miles from the Florida coast; in Kingston, not so far away; in St. Lucia, where her ships bound to the Pacific can take in coal, and in Barbadoes, at the extreme eastern end of the West Indian group. On the extreme north there is St. Johns, well protected and amply garrisoned. Further south she has Halifax, the headquarters of the North American squadron. Halifax is within two days of Boston. Her coaling facilities and the variety of coal are excellent. Coming further south, Great Britain holds Bermuda, due east of the Carolinas and distant 670 miles, or within two days' sailing of Chesapeake Bay. Around on the Pacific she has the great fortress at Vancouver, where coal is kept in large quantities from the British mines. From Vancouver south to Callao, she is without a station, but has made every effort to secure one somewhere along the Mexican or Central American coasts. The Monroe Doctrine, however, stands in her way.

On the other hand, not a single station is now under the authority of the United States. Years ago there was a dumping ground on the coast of Lower California, which it was proposed to convert into a station. This, however, seems to have been abandoned. The cession of land for a station at Samoa was followed by the shipment of 2,000 tons of coal for the use of war ships assigned to those waters, but the policy of the present administration to abandon its part of the Berlin agreement and to maintain no ships at Samoa has also led to the abandonment of further steps toward acquiring the station and the erection of buildings for coal sheds and repair shops. When Pearl Harbor in the Hawaii is acquired, which will probably not be accomplished during the following two years, there will then be an opportunity for the establishment of an important station, where all ships bound to and from the Pacific coast to the far East can receive coal. There is, however, less need for a coaling station in the Pacific than in the West Indies, and it will be there that the first efforts will be directed by the Navy Department toward acquiring some place where coal can be landed for the use of United States war ships. For years every Administration has appreciated the necessity of coaling stations, but all attempts to establish them have failed through lack of proper efforts. The value of a foothold somewhere in the West Indies has been recognized as paramount, and only a few years ago negotiations were pending between Hayti and this country to secure the right to occupy the Mole St. Nicholas. Further attempts have been made also to establish stations at St. Thomas and Samana Bay, at Santa Catharina, and at the Galapagos Islands off Ecuador.

Mr. McAdoo admits that with the growth of the navy, and the construction of mammoth war ships, requiring enormous coal supply, the question of coaling stations is one of vast importance. Key West, which is now the only place in the vicinity of the West Indies where American coal can be dumped, has not depth of water for large ships, and not one of Admiral Meade's fleet, except the Atlanta, could get alongside the docks there for coal. He believes that an island can be acquired in the West Indies, if money is appropriated, and that Congress will soon recognize the importance of taking some action toward acquiring one.